

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

LAW OF THE SEA

UNITED STATES DECISION TO REASSESS POSITION—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bob Rae (Broadview-Greenwood): Madam Speaker, since the Canadian delegation to the United Nations Conference on the International Law of the Sea expected, as did the rest of the world, that this year would see the successful conclusion of the treaty on the Law of the Sea, a treaty that would provide security for all countries and which, in particular, would ensure that the future exploitation of the world's renewable and non-renewable resources would be carried out in order to protect the common heritage of all mankind and not simply to address powerful, private economic interests, I move, seconded by the hon. member for New Westminster-Coquitlam (Miss Jewett):

That this House deeply regrets the decision of the United States government to reassess its commitments at the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in particular its decision to review the fundamental concepts of the common heritage of mankind, since these decisions will delay indefinitely the conclusion of a meaningful treaty on the Law of the Sea and threaten to sanctify the triumph of private greed over public good.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for this motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

* * *

PROPERTY RIGHTS

LEGISLATIVE PROVISIONS—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Bill Yurko (Edmonton East): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43 to move a motion of urgent importance. To my knowledge no political philosophy or party in this House advocates confiscation of private property without appropriate compensation and/or access to due process of law. Therefore I move, seconded by the hon. member for Etobicoke Centre (Mr. Wilson):

That this House categorically reject any legislative initiative or policy direction by government which advocates or incorporates into the laws of parliament retroactive expropriation by government, or Crown corporations of government, of property deemed to be private property without due compensation and/or access to due process of law.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for such a motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

Oral Questions

CRIMINAL CODE

PROTECTION AGAINST PERSONAL VIOLENCE—MOTION UNDER S.O. 43

Mr. Gus Mitges (Grey-Simcoe): Madam Speaker, I rise under the provisions of Standing Order 43. In view of the fact that crime in Canada is on the upswing, particularly in cases of rape and muggings, often resulting in severe beatings and death of victims who in most cases were not able to defend themselves against such vicious attacks, I move, seconded by the hon. member for Simcoe South (Mr. Stewart):

That the law of Canada be changed to make it legal for Canadians to be issued a permit to obtain Mace, a small cannister spray containing tear gas, to be legally carried and used for self-defence, and be used only under circumstances where a person feels his well-being is in jeopardy.

Madam Speaker: Is there unanimous consent for such a motion?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Some hon. Members: No.

● (1415)

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

[English]

PIPELINES

ALASKA GAS PIPELINE—UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT COMMITMENT

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Secretary of State for External Affairs and it concerns the Alaska highway natural gas pipeline. The minister will recall, as we all do, that in 1979 the builders of the American portion of the pipeline said that they would need government guarantees, in all probability, to build the U.S. portion. You will also remember, Madam Speaker, that his colleague, the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, told Parliament on July 17, 1980, as reported in *Hansard* at page 3061:

What was important to obtain from the American government was that firm commitment that they would see to it that the pipeline would be built. Whether they do it by financial commitment, legislation, or other means, that is for the American government to decide. What is important is that we have that commitment.

Today in this House, President Reagan specifically referred to "completion of the project based on private money". In other words, no government guarantees.

Would the Secretary of State for External Affairs tell the House whether the Government of Canada has the unqualified commitment of the government of the United States that the pipeline will be built?

Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Madam Speaker, the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition is as capable of interpreting the statements of the